## I'm not a bot



```
History is the study of past events, particularly in human affairs. It encompasses the recorded narratives and interpretations of human experiences, societies have evolved, understand the present context, and can make informed predictions about the
future. The term history originates from the Greek word historia, meaning inquiry or knowledge acquired by investigation. History is a disciplined inquiry into the human past, involving the critical analysis of sources to understand and
interpret events, cultures, and societies. Narrative Definition: History is the collective stories and accounts of past events, often constructed into narratives that explain causes and effects. Philosophical Definition: History is an exploration of human existence over time, considering not just events but also ideas, movements, and the progression of
human thought. Understanding Societal Development: History helps explain how societies and cultures have developed over time. Learning from the Past: By studying successes and failures, we can learn valuable lessons applicable to current and future challenges. Preserving Cultural Heritage: History preserves the traditions, values, and heritage of
societies, fostering a sense of identity. Critical Thinking and analytical study enhances critical thinking and developments chronologically. While these periods can vary by region and scholarly perspective, the following
are commonly recognized in Western historiography: Definition: The period before written records. Characteristics: Reliance on archaeological findings, artifacts, and fossils. Includes the Paleolithic (New Stone Age), periods. Key Developments: Human evolution and migration. Development
of stone tools. Beginnings of agriculture and settled communities. Definition: The period from the earliest recorded human history to the Early Middle Ages. Characteristics: Emergence of writing systems (e.g., cuneiform, hieroglyphics). Formation of early civilizations: Mesopotamia, Ancient Egypt, Indus Valley, Ancient China. Key Events: Rise and fall
of empires like the Roman Empire and Han Dynasty. Philosophical and religious foundations laid by figures like Socrates, Buddha, and Confucius. Development of laws and governance structures. Definition: The period between the fall of the Western Roman Empire and the beginning of the Renaissance. Characteristics: Feudal systems and
manorialism in Europe. The spread of major religions: Christianity, Islam, Buddhism. Limited technological and scientific advancements in Europe, often referred to as the Dark Ages. Key Events: The Crusades (religious wars between Christians and Muslims). The Black Death (bubonic plague pandemic). The rise of the Byzantine Empire and the
Islamic Golden Age. Definition: A period marked by the Renaissance, Reformation, and the beginning of European colonialism. Characteristics: Revival of art, culture, and learning based on classical antiquity (Renaissance). Religious reforms and the split of Christianity (Renaissanc
Events: The invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg. The Age of Discovery led by explorers like Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama. The Scientific Revolution with figures like Galileo Galilei and Isaac Newton. Definition: The period characterized by industrialization, globalization, and significant technological advancements.
Characteristics: Industrial Revolution leading to urbanization and the formation of nation-states. Two World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945). The digital revolution and the rise of the
internet. Historians use various methods to study and interpret the past. These methods involve critical analysis, sourcing, and interpretation to construct accurate and meaningful narratives. Definition: Examination of original documents or physical objects created during the time under study. Examples: Letters, diaries, official records, photographs,
artifacts. Application: Provides firsthand accounts, allowing historians to construct narratives based on direct evidence. Methodology: Source Criticism: Assessing the authenticity and reliability of sources within the broader historical context. Definition: Evaluation of works produced by other historians or scholars
interpreting primary sources. Examples: Books, articles, documentaries. Application: Builds upon existing scholarship to support or challenge interpretations. Methodology: Literature Review: Summarizing and evaluating existing research on a topic. Comparative Analysis: Comparing different historians interpretations. Definition: The study of how
history has been written and the varying perspectives over time. Application: Understanding the evolution of historical interpretations and the influence of contemporary contexts on historical writing. Definition: Incorporating
methods and theories from other disciplines such as archaeology, anthropology, sociology, and economics. Application: Enriches historical understanding by providing multiple perspectives. Methodology: Archaeological Methods: Excavation and artifact analysis to uncover physical evidence. Anthropological Methods: Studying cultural practices and
social structures. Definition: Using statistical and computational techniques to analyze historical data from records like censuses, economic reports. Statistical Analysis: Applying mathematical models to interpret
data.Definition: Collecting and studying historical information through recorded interviews with individuals having personal knowledge of past events. Application: Captures personal experiences and perspectives not found in written sources. Methodology:Interview Techniques: Developing questions and conducting interviews. Ethical Considerations:
Ensuring consent and respecting the narrators perspectives. Definition: Applying theoretical frameworks to analyze power structures, ideologies, and social constructs in history. Examples: Marxist theory, post-colonialism. Application: Challenges traditional narratives and highlights marginalized voices. Methodology: Deconstruction:
Analyzing texts to reveal underlying biases. Ideological Critique: Examining how ideology shapes historical narratives. Bias and Subjectivity: Historians must be aware of their own biases and those present in sources. Availability of Sources: Limited or fragmented sources can make reconstruction of events difficult. Interpretation Variability: Different
historians may interpret the same events differently based on perspectives and methodologies. History is a dynamic field that involves more than just recording events; it is about interpreting the past to understand human experiences and societal developments. By exploring various periods and employing diverse methods, historians provide valuable
insights into how our world has been shaped over time. The study of history not only preserves our heritage but also equips us with the knowledge to navigate present challenges and shape the future. Carr, E. H. (1961). What is History? Cambridge University Press. Tosh, J. (2015). The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the
Study of History. Routledge. Arnold, J. (2000). History: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press. 1. Definition of History of History of History of History of History. Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). New Perspectives on History of History. Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). New Perspectives on History of History. Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). New Perspectives on History. Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). Routledge. Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). Routledge. Burke, P. (2001). Routled
past. What historians do is produce knowledge about the past, or, with respect to each individual, fallible historian, produce contributions to knowledge about the past produced by historians, together with everything that is involved in the production,
communication of, and teaching about that knowledge. 2. The Necessity for History All developed countries have their National Archives (called the Public Record Office in Britain) and a historical profession, both paid for out of taxpayers' money. This is in recognition of the simple fact that knowledge of the past is essential to society. What happens
in the present, and what will happen in the future, is very much governed by what happened in the past. It is obvious that knowledge of the past has not brought easy solutions to problems in, say, Northern Ireland, the Balkans, or Palestine. But without a thorough knowledge of past events and circumstances, we could not even attempt to grapple
with these problems. Without knowledge of the past we would be like to live in a society where there was absolutely no knowledge of the past." The mind boggles. Of
course, if history has this vital importance for society, then it must be as accurate as possible, it must be based on evidence and logical thought, not on specious theory or political ideology. 3. Other Justifications for History Those who study history, for career purposes, or just for personal enjoyment, have other reasons apart from this all-embracing
justification for national resources being channelled into the study of history. Many of us feel the almost poetic appeal of the past, have a passionate interest in finding out what really did happen in the past - practically all of the world's major tourist traps relate to the appeal of the past (the Tower of London, San Gimignano in Tuscany, Ephesus in
Turkey). It is historians who provide the contextual knowledge that eventually works its way into the guide books, and again the need is for accuracy not specious theory. Historians also provide the contextual knowledge for great works of art and literature, thus enhancing our enjoyment of these. In addition, the study of history offers to individuals
major utilitarian learning outcomes. Training in history is training in history is training in history, secondary or primary, must be approached with scepticism and caution. It develops the ability to distinguish between pieces of
writing which are well-substantiated and logical, and those which simply express theory, hypothesis, or opinion. The skills and learning outcomes rising from historical study are invaluable in a contemporary world which is dominated by information and communications. The methods and skills required of the historian, and, more important, the
attitudes of mind transmitted in the teaching of history, are of vital importance in assessing and filtering the messages constantly battering against us. History also provides a training in the writing up of the results of one's researches, in the form of essays, reports, dissertations. What is essential in history is clear and effective communication, well
structured, and written in precise and explicit language. 4. The Subjectivity, and while, as citizens, we certainly should act upon our political commitment. That is sheer is self-indulgence. History is a scholarly, not a political, activity, and while, as citizens, we certainly should act upon our political
views, in writing history we have an absolute obligation to try to exclude them. Most historians, like, most scientists, are motivated by the urge to find out. Much nonsense is talked about historians inevitably being "subjective"; the real point is that, being mere human beings, they are "fallible", and subject to many kinds of career and social pressures,
or indeed common incompetence. Historians do disagree with each other in their interpretations, as do scientists. But history deals with human values, in a way the sciences do not, so there is more scope for differences in evaluation. Historical evidence is fragmentary, intractable, and imperfect. Individual books and articles may clash with each
other; there will always be areas where uncertainty persists, but steadily agreed knowledge emerges in the form of works of synthesis and high-quality textbooks. Historians (usually themselves) as great literary and media figures, as individual
intellectual and moral giants giving leadership to ordinary readers. Such historians - subscribers to what I call the "auteur theory" - tend to glory in their own subjectivity. By all means enjoy their literary flourishes, but always remember that the aims of a work of history are very different from those of a work of literature. 5. History and the Past The
existence of the (mistaken) notion that historians "reconstruct" the past does indicate that there is an awareness of the distinction between "history" and "the past", though this distinction is often obfuscated. Particularly is this the case with the metahistorians - A.J. Toynbee, right-wing political scientists like Francis Fukuyama, Marxists, and
postmodernists - who, apart from any other uses, apply the term "history" to some great process (invented by themselves) whereby the past unfolds in a series of stages into the present and on into the future. In their own studies this process is taken as a given, and they test the history of historians against this given. No, to keep clear of all the
the dividing of the past up into the eras or periods, has no a priori existence. It is simply an analytical tool of historians. A periodization which makes sense for economic history, may well not make sense for social or political history. 7. Primary and Secondary
Sources The only way we can have knowledge of the past is through studying the relics and traces left by past societies, the primary sources. Primary sources, as it were, form the basic "raw material" of history; they are sources which came into existence within the period being investigated. The articles and books written up later by historians,
drawing upon these primary sources, converting the raw material into history, are secondary sources for still later historians, but this is a matter of such triviality as scarcely to be worth bothering about). The distinction between primary sources is a matter of such triviality as scarcely to be worth bothering about).
critical one, though no historian has ever pretended that it offers a magic key to the nature of historical study, or that primary sources have a necromantic potency denied to secondary ones. There is always some excitement about being in contact with a genuine primary source, but one will not learn very much from a single source. Reading through
an edited selection of excerpts from primary sources will have the salutary effect of bringing one in contact with the thinking and language of past generations, but it will not amount to research. If the ordinary reader, or history student, wants to learn quickly about the role and status of women during the Renaissance, or about the causes of the First
World War, they will be well advised to go to the secondary authorities, a knowledge of the principles of history being useful in separating out the more reliable from the less. But if you are planning to make an original contribution to historical knowledge, you are unlikely to make much of a stir if you stick strictly to other people's work, that is, the
secondary sources - to which, it should be stressed the research historian will frequently return throughout all stages of research and writing. The difference is critical in that strategy which all historians, in one way or another, devise in embarking on a new research project. It is through the secondary sources that one becomes beware of the gaps in
knowledge, problems unsolved, suspect explanations. It is with the aid of the secondary sources, and all the other resources of the profession, that one begins to identify the archives in which one will commence one's researches. Primary sources, numbingly copious in some areas, are scarce and fragmentary in others. Much has to be garnered
indirectly and by inference. Historians do not rely on single sources, but are always seeking corroboration, qualification, correction; the production of history is very much a matter of accumulating details, refining nuances. The technical skills of the historian lie in sorting these matters out, in understanding how and why a particular source came into
existence, how relevant it is to the topic under investigation, and, obviously, the particular codes or language in accordance with which the particular source came into being as a concrete artefact. Philosophers, and others ignorant of history, get confused because they think "primary" means "more truthful", and "secondary" means "less truthful".
That is not the distinction at all. A good secondary source will be as reliable as the historian can possibly make it. Primary sources are full of prejudices and errors. They were written to serve the interests of historians coming along later: they were written to serve the interests of those who created them, going about their own business. We need
to understand not just the distinction between primary and secondary sources, but also that there are different types and levels of secondary source. These range from the most highly specialised research as well as summarise the work of others, to the simple
textbooks, and then on to the many types of popular and non-academic history. 8. Witting and Unwitting Testimony In their work, historians have always recognised that primary sources, as well as containing many kinds of imperfection, also contain many types and many layers of evidence, even if they have tended not to make explicit statements
about this. The crucial, though never absolutely rigid, distinction is between the "unwitting" testimony and the "unwitting" means "deliberate" or "intentional"; "unwitting testimony" is the deliberate or intentional message of a document or other source; the
"unwitting testimony" is the unintentional evidence (about, for example, the attitudes and values of the author, or about the "culture" to which he/she belongs) that it also contains. Actually, it is the writer, creator, or creators of the document or source who is, or are, intentional or unintentional, not the testimony itself, so these phrases are examples
of a figure of speech, the transferred epithet, where the adjective, which strictly speaking should be applied to a person, is transferred to what the person produced - the phrase is all the more effective for that. An understanding of the nature of unwitting testimony, often the most valuable evidence for a historian, might have guarded against the
obscure technical terms, words and phrases which have changed their meanings over the centuries, attitudes and concepts which no longer exist today, and may be scarcely expressible in the language of today. 9. The Arts as Sources It is fun, and it is becoming fashionable, for historians to work with novels, films, paintings, and even music. Doing
this is not evidence of some superior virtue, or sensibility; in fact, most of what we know about most periods in the past will continue to come from novels, as if these, in themselves, somehow provided some extra illumination. Worse, historians refer to characters in
novels (or even films) as if they were real people. If cultural artefacts are to be used at all in serious historical writing (and I believe they should - they can be invaluable for attitudes, values, and quality of cultural information
about the artefact, and its production and reception, to make the reference a genuine contribution to knowledge: one must provide a "Quintessential Summary" (nature of the artefact the crucial questions to ask are "Does it tell us anything we didn't
know already?", and, more probingly, "Does it tell us anything we couldn't discover more readily from another sources for living conditions and standards, as paintings of domestic scenes have sometimes been used as sources for what people ate. But it is far better to go directly to the actual statistics of
wage rates and to social investigations for the first topic, and to household accounts, statistics of retail sales and so on for the latter one. A painting of eighteenth-century French peasants consuming bread, garlic and wine may be evidence of their regular diet, but there is always the quite strong possibility that the artist might have been more
concerned with infusing his painting with the religious symbolism of the Last Supper than with accurate sociological observation. It is perfectly legitimate for editors and publishers to wish to brighten up articles and books by including reproductions of various works of art. But, with rare exceptions, such art works will, at best, be no more than
illustrations; at worst they may have little real relevance to what is being said in the article or book. Serious historians should only use such reproductions as genuine primary source. 10. Strategy and Structure I have already mentioned the
need for identifying a research strategy, using the secondary sources to identify the topics to be addressed and the archives to be used. The writing up one's research in the primary sources, or perhaps the consultation of more
secondary sources. The writing of history imposes demands on historians which are very different from those of writing a novel, or, say, literary criticism or sociology. In producing an account which presents a sense of chronological change, and, perhaps, of the movement from one period to another, incorporates explanation, analysis and description
explains causes and consequences, discusses different topics and themes and different aspects of the past (economic, cultural, and so on), and what changed, and what did not, it is essential to develop a structure (that is, the sequence of chapters and
sections within chapters, and the way in which these are related to each other). 11. Writing History We expect novelists, poets, and playwrights to exploit the ambiguities and resonances of language, even, perhaps, to express directly the dictates of the unconscious, not always logical in its choice of words. Historians, on the other hand, should converge to the unconscious of the unconscio
their findings as clearly and explicitly as possible. Some metaphors may be an aid to communication, others will simply contribute to confusion and obfuscation. With all the temptations to indulge in metaphor and revise. What
is it you really want to say? Is precise explication really assisted by phrases like, "webs of meaning", "cultural scripts", "discursive domains"? Revise, not to achieve elaborate literary effect, but to convey precisely what you mean to the reader. An exact, uncluttered style is essential to historical communication, it is not an extra; and if the style can be
elegant (which is very different from being elaborate or rhetorical) so much the better. Sentiment is not enough in historical writing, what is needed is thought. 12. Nothing Ruled Out All human activities, including history, are culturally constructed" or
"culturally determined". Too many nave statements have been made along the lines of "each age rewrites its history". History is not a formation dance in which everybody in one period marches in one direction, and then, in the next, marches off in a different direction. What has happened in the history of historical writing is that the scope, and the
sophistication, of history have steadily extended. In the twentieth century there was some development away from political history is intrinsically better than another: provided the fundamental, but ever-expanding methodologies are adhered to, it all depends upon which topics
and questions are being addressed. In the recent study of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths of history greater emphasis has been given to comparative history and to cultural history: but one of the greatest strengths are comparative history and the greatest strengths are comparative history.
up of which language is deployed with the utmost precision. There must be constant awareness of the methods and principles of that discipline, constant attention to how it is taught, and how, at different levels, it is communicated to wider audiences. John Douglas Belshaw Editors note: This chapter is from an introduction to a survey of Canadian
History, so most if not all of the examples are from North America, but the general ideas apply very well to World History as well. We review four issues of what is implied by history and historical writing (historiography) youll miss
many of the key issues in the study of the past. Its something like watching your first foreign film. You know theres more going on than meets the eye and that the experience would be better if you just knew what it was. Researching history. How historians do their research historical method is different from history (that is, the account that you
read). Historians find their bricks and mortar somewhere, and they need to organize them in ways that will stand up over time, although historian find their bricks and mortar somewhere, and they need to organize them in ways that will stand up over time, although historian find their bricks and mortar somewhere, and they need to organize them in ways that will stand up over time, although historian find their bricks and mortar somewhere, and they need to organize them in ways that will stand up over time, although history is also often revised as new evidence emerges or research methodology evolves.
or steel is forged. What Is History? In asking what history is, you must also ask, what is historical writing and the study of history. Historical writing is correctly called historiography, whichencompasses both the doing (the
writing of history) and the reflecting on (the study of history). In the Western tradition, Herodotus (ca. 484-425 BCE) is considered as the Father of History, but the paternity of historical writing in China probably began about 500 years before Herodotus was
born, and everywhere human societies have appeared, there have been sagas and chronicles of some kind. Some of these were done with more literary licence than others. Brian Thom points out that the oral tradition of the Hulquminum (of the Coast Salish nations [in North America]) notes a difference between syuth (true histories) and sxwiem
(fables and moral tales). This distinction is made by many cultures and is important to keep in mind: stories from and about the past take different forms and they do so to serve different purposes. Written and oral histories alike adhere to two basic rules: reliability and verifiability. For the historian whose goal is to deliver as truthful a tale as possible
these rules are the gold standard for evidence. Figure 1.1 A fragment of the Book of Documents attributed to Confucius (551-479 BCE). If the source is trustworthy, then its reliable. Take the example of Bartolom de las Casas, who was among the first Europeans in the Caribbean and who spent nearly half a century working as a priest, missionary,
plantation owner, bishop, and colonial administrator in Hispaniola, Venezuela, and Mexico. When he wrote of the vicious Spanish conquest of Haiti My eyes have seen these acts so foreign to human nature, and now I tremble as I write, not believing them myself, afraid that perhaps I was dreaming. But truly this sort of thing has happened all over the
Indies, and more cruelly too sometimes, and I am quite sure that I have not forgotten. we are inclined to believe him, not least because he wasnt going to win himself any friends by speaking out. [2] Figure 1.2 Bartolom de las Casas. If historians can prove the claims made by their source, thats verifiability. The best biographies go far beyond the
personal diaries and letters written by their subject and look to other sources to confirm that the subject did what he or she claimed to have done. Another example, this one drawn from population history, shows some of the challenges of official documents. Bruce Curtis examined the early days of the census of Canada and found that Canada West
 (Ontario) and Canada East (Quebec) counted people differently.[3] In the former, people were counted based on where they were on census day; in the latter, they were counted based on where they were supposed to be. This means that Canada Easts census takers included locals who were off working in factories in other jurisdictions,
perhaps in New England. Butin Canada West, anyone who was a recent arrival in a new townwould most likely be overlooked. Without this bit of knowledge in hand, we might be forgiven for assuming that an official source like the census would be 100%
reliable; however, thanks to local tax records, church registers, and other documents, we are in a position to verify the official numbers. Serious historians seek to be both reliable and verifiable, which iswhy youll typically find a torrent of references supporting a scholarly study. The point is to demonstrate that the writer can be trusted because he or
she hasdone the necessary digging and cross-checking. As well, studies that are well supported by references say to the reader, Feel free to check it yourself and, by all means, use the information Ive found to further your own studies. This reflects another tendency in historical research: the desire to share discoveries. Holding back sources raises both
suspicion and eyebrows in readers. Researching History just never gets old. Or does it? If historians use only verifiable and reliable sources, surely at some point we should have all the history were ever going to need. But a paradox exists about history: ithas a stale-date. Our understanding of the past is constantly subject to change. This
makes history opentorevision, and its practitioners (that is, all serious historians) are sometimes pejoratively called revisionists. There do exist some landmark studies that stand the test of time, but more often than not conclusions reached by historians a generation or more ago are subject to a second (and third and fourth) look. Why is it that history
is regularly freshened up? Why does revisionism happen? New evidence emerges Sometimes although rarely lost documents are found that shed new light on a historical event. For example, in the article Reluctant Warriors: British North Americans and the War of 1812, author E. Jane Errington reveals previously unexamined evidence from the
newspapers of the time that Upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts and in popular mythology.[4]More usual is for new evidence to emerge through discoveries made in a different field say, medicine that Upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts and in popular mythology.[4]More usual is for new evidence to emerge through discoveries made in a different field say, medicine that upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts and in popular mythology.[4]More usual is for new evidence to emerge through discoveries made in a different field say, medicine that upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts and in popular mythology.[4]More usual is for new evidence to emerge through discoveries made in a different field say, medicine that upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts and in popular mythology.[4]More usual is for new evidence to emerge through discoveries made in a different field say, medicine that upper Canadians were not the fearless protectors of the homeland that they had appeared to be in earlier accounts.
Kelm could have written Colonizing Bodies: Aboriginal Health and Healing in British Columbia, 1900-50without the knowledge that medical research provided toward the end of the 20th century.[5] Cross-fertilization of this kind happens all the time, transforming definitive histories into conditional histories. Figure 1.3 In this 1896 painting, General
Isaac Brock encourages the volunteer Upper Canadian troops in the War of 1812: Push on, brave York volunteers. Recent research suggests that Upper Canadian enthusiasm for the war was, in fact, muted. Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters. Recent research suggests that Upper Canadian enthusiasm for the war was, in fact, muted. Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters Ideology matters.
agendas) also affect our perception of history. For example, Ian McKay of Queens University in Kingston, Ontario, has been the key figure in identifying the importance of liberalism in Canadian history, both as a phenomenon and as a lens through which the past is viewed. (Note that here we are talking about small-l liberalism, as opposed to capital-L
Liberalism, which is associated with the Liberal Party of Canada.) Liberalism, as a political ideology, places an emphasis on the individual has been promoted as more important to Canadian history and public policy than groups or sub-nations. Think about how thiscan affect
our view of Canadian history. If the history of Canada is about the rise of the individual in a liberal-democratic state (one in which more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more broadly to individuals), how does that affect of leaving the history of Canada is about the rise of the individual in a liberal-democratic state (one in which more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which rights are extended more and more people get the vote and in which right
various times in their history, have demonstrated a strong predisposition for being seen as one nation first and as many individuals second? Or how does this ideology of individuals second?
enhance the condition of the individual by means of a larger, social welfare state. These ideals of democratic rights and a social safety netwere a formative influence on nearly three generations of historians. In your lifetime there has been a growing reaction to state-liberalism from the Right. So-called neo-liberalism seeks a return to the classical
liberalism of the 18th and early 19th centuries wherein the individual operates in a free market unfettered by government regulation and it is more supportive of collective identities while at the same time subscribing to the essentially liberal view that
individual choice in a democracy is non-negotiable. Just because these perspectives exist happily together in the mainstream does not mean they are not ideologically loaded. Historians writing from any one of these perspectives exist happily together in the mainstream does not mean they are not ideologically loaded. Historians writing from any one of these perspectives exist happily together in the mainstream does not mean they are not ideologically loaded. Historians writing from any one of these perspectives exist happily together in the mainstream does not mean they are not ideologically loaded.
historians draw attention to the economic structures that overlay peoples lives in the past. Environmentalism invites us to look at the history of the fur trade, resource-extraction industries like logging and fishing, and the fabric of cities in ways that recast the environment from something that was acted upon to something that has an impact on
human actors. Certainly feminism continues to have an enormous and laudable impact on historical thinking. Theological approaches to the writing of history are much less in vogue now than they once were, but imperialism(which, for centuries, had a strong theological and evangelical component) continues to influence the story of the nation-state in
profound and very subtle ways. How scholars see society is one part of this ideological rainbow; how people in the past saw society ideologically is another. Its complicated, but its hugely important in the context of how history is presented and written about. Perspectives on what happened in the past may be informed by our concerns in the present,
but thats not the same thing assaying thatthe past exists for the benefit of the present. The Maritimes historian George Rawlyk once wrote thatall historical writing is basically autobiographical in nature.[6] That is to say, the history we look for reflects the interests of our time and is constrained by the ways that our culture thinks. A society that is
interested in the civil rights of women is more likely to ask questions on that topic than one that is not. By the same token, earlier generations of historians looked to the past for answers to questions on that topic than one that is not. By the same token, earlier generations of historians looked to the past for answers to questions that most of us today would not care to pose. The Canadian novelist William Gibson contributes this view: The past changes. Our version of the past will
interest the future to about the extent were interested in whatever past the Victorians believed in.[7] We have concerns and perspectives that are different from past generations and from those that will be nourished by future generations. This does not mean, however, that we have a licence to shop around in the past for vindications of the present.It
is in the nature of historical celebrations to claim that it is thanks to historical events that we enjoy the freedoms that we do today, or that without the fur trade, Canada as we know it simply would not exist. This is called the presentist fallacy. What if we view our present dimlydue to high unemployment, repressive legislation, massive cuts at the CBC,
and environmental disaster constantly on the horizon? Would we then say that these things arethe fault of whatever it was that these things arethe fault of whatever it was that these things arethe fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that these things are the fault of whatever it was that the fur trade is to blame? Bias can be okay we can be biased in our search for evidence of adolescent rebelliousness in early Nova Scotia and ignore much else that was going on at that time but the fur trade is to blame? Bias can be okay we can be biased in our search for evidence of adolescent rebelliousness in early Nova Scotia and ignore much else that was going on at that time but the fur trade is to blame? Bias can be okay we can be biased in our search for evidence of adolescent rebelliousness.
we cannot favour one outcome over another and certainly we cannot favour an outcome in ourpresent. Methodological approaches evolve It isnt enough for a historian to be a bloodhound who sniffsout the rare fact. The historian to be a capable and versatile analyst. That means that each generation of historians will find a new way of cracking the
code of the past. The application of good quantitative historical sciences has had a great impact on the telling of history, and has sometimescompletely toppled older histories. An example of an evolving approach is presented in Wendy Wickwires article To See Ourselves as the Others Other, which makes the case
for using oral histories to examine events that took place centuries ago.[8] More than 20 years before Wickwires article appeared, Bruce Trigger made a similar point regarding ethnohistory and the study of the Wendat/Huron First Nation. It is largely thanks to research of this kind that Aboriginal oral traditions have acquired greater and greater
respect and credibility in the courtroom over the last two decades.[9] Further, demographic historians, especially in Quebec, have devised new ways of analyzing population information held in censuses, birth and death records, and baptismal and marriagerecords. The end effect is that history is constantly being rewritten withnew discoveries, new
information, new perspectives, and new conclusions. It allmakes for a dynamic field, despite thereputation that history has in some quarters for being dusty, musty, and dull. Figure 1.4 A page from the Book of Negros, which lists the 3,000 African-Americans who departed from New York as freed loyalists in 1783. Documents like this may provide both
qualitative and quantitative evidence to historiansEndnotes:[1] Brian Thom, Coast Salish World (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 2005), 81.[2] Bartolom de las Casas, History of the Indies, trans. and ed. Andre M. Collard (Toronto: Fitzhenry and
Whiteside, 1971), 121.[3] Bruce Curtis, The Politics of Population: State Formation, Statistics, and the Census of Canada, 1840-1875 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).[4] E. Jane Errington, Reluctant Warriors: British North Americans and the War of 1812, The Sixty Years War for the Great Lakes, 1754-1814, eds. David Curtis Skaggs and
Larry L. Nelson (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2001): 325-336.[5] Mary Ellen Kelm, Colonizing Bodies: Aboriginal Health and Healing in British Columbia, 1900-50 (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1999).[6] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1999).[6] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1999).[6] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1999).[6] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1999).[6] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, Bap
Press, 1984), ix.[7] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1984), ix.[8] G. A. Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1984), ix.[8] For a detailed
 discussion of these developments, see Bruce Granville Miller, Oral History on Trial: Recognizing Aboriginal Narratives in Court (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011). Attributions Figure 1.2 Bartolomedelascasas by Nagypajais in the public domain. Figure 1.3 Push on, brave York volunteers by
Scorpius 59 is in the public domain. Figure 1.42book 0706b by Dr Wilson is in the public domain. Philosophy & Religion Humanities historiography, the writing of history, especially the writing of history based on the critical examination of sources, and the synthesis of those
details into a narrative that stands the test of critical examination. The term historiography also refers to the theory and historical writing. Modern historical writing. Modern historical writing from the development in the
late 18th and early 19th centuries of scientific history and the simultaneous rise of history as an academic profession. It springs from an outlook that is very new in human experience: the assumption that the study of history is a natural, inevitable human activity. Before the late 18th century, historiography did not stand at the centre of any
civilization. History was almost never an important part of regular education, and it never claimed to provide an interpretation of human life as a whole. This larger ambition was more appropriate to religion, philosophy, and perhaps poetry and other imaginative literature. All human cultures tell stories about the past. Deeds of ancestors, heroes, gods,
or animals sacred to particular peoples were chanted and memorized long before there was any writing with which to record them. Their truth was authenticated by the very fact of their continued repetition. History, which may be defined as an account that purports to be true of events and ways of thinking and feeling in some part of the human past,
stems from this archetypal human narrative activity. While sharing a common ancestry with myth, legend, epic poetry, and the novel, history has of course diverged from these forms. Its claim to truth is based in part on the fact that all the persons or events it describes really existed or occurred at some time in the past. Historians can say nothing
about these persons or events that cannot be supported, or at least suggested, by some kind of documentary evidence. Such evidence customarily takes the form of some previous historian. In addition, historians sometimes create their own evidence by interviewing
people. In the 20th century the scope of historical evidence was greatly expanded to include, among many other things, aerial photographs, the rings of trees, old coins, clothes, motion pictures, and houses. Modern historians have determined the age of the Shroud of Turin, which purportedly bears the image of Jesus, through carbon-14 dating and
have discredited the claim of Anna Anderson to be the grand duchess Anastasia, the daughter of Tsar Nicholas II, through DNA testingJust as the methods at the disposal of historians have expanded, so have the subjects in they have become interested. Many of the indigenous peoples of Africa, the Americas, and Polynesia, for example, were long
dismissed by Europeans as having no precolonial history, because they did not keep written records before the arrival of European explorers. However, sophisticated study of oral traditions, combined with advances in archaeology, has made it possible to discover a good deal about the civilizations and empires that flourished in these regions before
European contact. Historians have also studied new social classes. The earliest histories were mostly stories of disastersfloods, famines, and plaquesor of wars, including the statesmen and generals who figured in them. In the 20th century, however, historians shifted their focus from statesmen and generals to ordinary workers and soldiers. Until
relatively recent times, however, most men and virtually all women were excluded from history because they were unable to write. Virtually all that was known about them passed through that filter has been met by historians in various ways. One way is to make use of
nontraditional sourcesfor example, personal documents, such as wills or marriage contracts. Another is to look at the records of localities rather than of central governments. Through these means even the most oppressed peoples African-American slaves or medieval heretics, for example have had at least some of their history restored. Since the 20th
century some historians have also become interested in psychological repressioni.e., in attitudes and actions that require psychological insight and even diagnosis to recover and understand. For the first time, the claim of historians to deal with the feelings as well as the thoughts of people in any part of the human past has been made good. None of
this is to say that history writing has assumed a perfect or completed form. It will never do so: examination of its past reveals remarkable changes in historical consciousness rather than steady progress toward the standards of research and writing that represent the best that historians can do today. Nevertheless, 21st-century historians understand
the pasts of more people more completely and more accurately than their predecessors did. This article demonstrates the scope of that accomplishment and how it came to be achieved. This resource was developed in 2004 as part of The Conguest of Mexico by Nancy Fitch. What Is History? Most people believe that history is a collection of facts about
the past. This is reinforced through the use of textbooks used in teaching history. They are written as though they are collections of information. In fact, history is NOT a collection of facts about the past. History consists of making arguments about what happened in the past on the basis of what people recorded (in written documents, cultural
artifacts, or oral traditions) at the time. Historians often disagree over what the facts are as well as over how they should be interpreted. The problem is complicated for major events that produce winners and losers, since we are more likely to have sources written by the winners, designed to show why they were heroic in their victories. History in
Your TextbookMany textbooks acknowledge this in lots of places. For example, in one book, the authors write, The stories of their companions, the conquests of Mexico and Peru are epic tales told by the victors. Glorified by the victors. Glorified by the victors of their companions, the conquests of their companions.
authors then continue to describe Corts s actions that ultimately led to the capture of Cuauhtmoc, who ruled the Mexicas after Moctezuma died. From the authors perspective, there is no question that Moctezuma died when he was hit by a rock thrown by one of his own subjects. When you read accounts of the incident, however, the situation was so
unstable, that it is not clear how Moctezuma died. Note: There is little analysis in this passage. The authors are simply telling the story based upon Spanish versions of what happened. There is no explanation of why the Mexicas lost. Many individuals believe that history is about telling stories, but most historians also want
answers to questions like why did the Mexicas lose? What Are Primary Sources? To answer these questions, historians turn to primary sources, sources that were written at the time of the event, in this case written from 1519-1521 in Mexico. These would be firsthand accounts. Unfortunately, in the case of the conquest of Mexico, there is only one
genuine primary source written from 1519-1521. This primary sources, although they were written long after the conquest. One example consists of the account written by Cortss companion, Bernal Daz del Castillo. Other accounts consist of
Mexica and other Nahua stories and traditions about the conquest of Mexico from their point of view. Making Arguments in the Textbook Historians then use these sources to make arguments, which could possibly be refuted by different interpretations of the same evidence or the discovery of new sources. For example, the Bentley and Ziegler
textbook make several arguments on page 597 about why the Spaniards won: Steel swords, muskets, cannons, and horses offered Corts and his men some advantage over the forces they met and help to account for the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire. Quite apart from military technology, Corts expedition benefited from divisions among the
indigenous peoples of Mexico. With the aid of Doa Marina, the conquistadors forged alliances with peoples who resented domination by the Mexicas, the leaders of the Aztec empire. Ideally, under each of these thesis statements, that is, each of these arguments about why the Mexicas were defeated, the authors will give some examples of information
that backs up their thesis. To write effective history and history essays, in fact to write successfully in any area, you should begin your essay with the thesis. Since the Bentley and Ziegler book does not provide any evidence to back up their main arguments, you can easily
use the material available here to provide evidence to support your claim that any one of the above arguments is better than the others. You could also use the evidence to introduce other possibilities: Mocteuzumas poor leadership, Corts craftiness, or disease. Become a Critical ReaderTo become a critical reader, to empower yourself to own your own
history, you should think carefully about whether the evidence to back up their main points, you may want to explore your class notes on the topic and then examine the primary sources included on the Conquest
of Mexico on this web site. Your Assignment for Writing History with Primary Sources the theses presented in the book and use information from primary sources to disprove itthe trash the book approach. Or, if your professor has said something in class that your professor has said something in class that you might take any of the theses presented in the book approach.
are not sure about, find material to disprove itthe trash the prof approach (and, yes, it is really okay if you have the evidence). Another approach is to include new information that the authors ignored. For example, the authors say nothing about omens. If one analyzes omens in the conquest, will it change the theses or interpretations presented in the
textbook? Or, can one really present a Spanish or Mexica perspective? Another approach is to make your own thesis, i.e., one of the biggest reasons for the conquest was that Moctezuma fundamentally misunderstood Corts. When Sources DisagreeIf you do work with the Mexican materials, you will encounter the harsh reality of historical research:
the sources do not always agree on what happened in a given event. It is up to you, then, to decide who to believe. Most historians would probably believe Corts letters were the most likely to be accurate, but is this statement justified? Corts was in the heat of battle and while it looked like he might win easy victory in 1519, he did not complete his
mission until 1521. The Cuban Governor, Diego Velzquez wanted his men to capture Corts and bring him back to Cuba on charges of insubordination. Was he painting an unusually rosy picture of his situation so that the Spanish King would continue to support him? It is up to you to decide. Have the courage to own your own history! Daz Del Castillo
wrote his account later in his life, when the Spaniards were being attacked for the harsh policies they implemented in Mexico after the conquest. He also was upset that Corts was responsible for the heroic nature of the Spanished a book that made it appear that only Corts was responsible for the conquest. There is no question that the idea of the heroic nature of the Spanished a book that made it appear that only Corts was responsible for the conquest.
actions is clearest in his account. But does this mean he was wrong about what he said happened and why? It is up to you to decide. The Mexica accounts are the most complex since they were originally oral histories told in Nahuatl that were then written down in a newly rendered alphabetic Nahuatl. They include additional Mexica illustrations of
their version of what happened, for painting was a traditional way in which the Mexicas wrote history. Think about the primary sources is to ask the questions: (1)
when was the source written, (2) who is the intended audience of the source, (3) what are the differences between the accounts, (4) what are the differences between the accounts, (5) what pieces of information in the accounts, (6) what information in the accounts, (7) what are the differences between the accounts, (8) what are the differences between the accounts, (9) what are the differences between the accounts, (9) what are the differences between the accounts, (10) what are the accounts, (10) what are the accounts, (10) what are the accounts with a constant and the accounts which are the accounts whi
make, While the past itself never changes, history our understanding and interpretation of the past is always evolving. New historians explore and conclusions that may change the way we understand the past. Historians explore and interpret the past through their own methods, priorities and values. They develop new theories and conclusions that may change the way we understand the past is always evolving.
examinesthis process of change. Historiography is adifficult field of study. It is a critical component of most high-level college history courses, where students are expected not only to know about historiography, usually
through the study of different historians and different historians and different historical perspectives. To understand historiography, one must first accept that history is never set in stone. While the past never changes, our understand the critical difference
between historical facts (things shown conclusively by evidence and accepted as true) and history (the human study and interpretation of these things). History certainly contains millions of concrete truths or facts. Abraham Lincoln was shot and killed by John Wilkes Booth in 1865; the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbour in December 1941; Germany was
gripped by rampant hyperinflation in 1923; approximately 58,000 American servicemen were killed in the Vietnam War. On the evidence currently available, those facts are beyond doubt. But taken on their own, these facts are unrevealing they do not explain why these events happened, their consequences or their significance. The role of the historian
is to make sense of these facts through research and analysis. They do this by examining and interpreting evidence, forming conclusions, developing theories and why particular actions, events or ideas came to be (causes). The outcomes of particular
actions, events or ideas (effects or consequences). The contributions made by different people, groups and ideas (actions). The relative importance or impact of different people, groups or ideas (significance). Things that altered and things the altered and things the a
churns out different answers to the same question. Historians frequently study the same sets of facts butend up reaching different explanations or conclusions. As an analogy, think of a significant historical event as a major sporting event, like an important football match watched by thousands of people. Football matches have very clear factual
outcomes: scoring charts, a final score, team and player statistics, player injuries and so forth. Explaining these outcomes to various factors: player selections, the performance of individual players, fitness or injuries, umpiring decisions, weather,
ground conditions, home ground advantage, coaching tactics, pivotal moments in the game, and so forth. There may be some consensus about these factors but there is rarely broad agreement. In some respects, historians are like sports journalists except they focus on the past. They explain outcomes after the fact, relying on evidence but also their
own judgement and interpretations. These interpretations can vary markedly, to the point where the work of one historiography can also describe the body of history written about a particular person, period or event. The historiography of the French Revolution, for example,
describes every significant history book written about that revolution. Some of these historiographies can be enormous. Millions of history books, articles and reference texts have been written about topics on the Alpha History website. This
```

is far from the case. Public interest in historical periods like the American Civil War, Nazi Germany and the two World Wars remains high. This interest drives both new academic research and commercial demand for new books. Sometimes new books contain no significant new ideas: they simply rehash existing knowledge and present it in a different

form (as Max Beerbohm once put it, historians repeat one another). But some books do offer new evidence, interpretations or arguments and sometimes they challenge our existing understanding. The image above shows a tower of books in Washington DC, just across from Fords Theatre, where Abraham Lincoln was guined down in 1865. It is constructed from books on one topic: Abraham Lincoln. All books in the tower are unique that is, it contains only one copy of each book. Among these texts are studies of Lincolns childhood, family and personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his presidency and leadership during the US Civil War; his attitudes about slavery and African-Americans. Each book contains the authors own interpretation of Lincoln. Somehave advanced some new evidence, interpretations of Lincolns childhood, family and personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his presidency and leadership during the US Civil War; his attitudes about slavery and African-Americans. Each book contains the authors own interpretation of Lincoln. Somehave advanced some new evidence, can old how a family and personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his presidency and leadership during the US Civil War; his attitudes about the can old how and the post is a living, growing his personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his presidency and leadership during the US Civil War; his attitudes about its death of Lincolns can old politics, his constructed from books on one topics relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his possible politics, his contains only one can do there shall be a living in the US Civil War; his details and the unique that its death historians and personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his possible politics, his possible politics, his possible politics, his device the unique that its death of Lincolns and personal relationships; his legal career and entry into politics, his possible

History writing. How is history written by the victors. How old is written history. The study of how history is written. How old is written records history. How is history created. What is the study of history which refers to how what and why history is written. How is checking out me history written. How old is china's written history. How old is chinese written history. How old is human written history.